



September 9, 2014

The Honorable Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Governor of California
State Capitol
Suite 1173
Sacramento, CA 95814

HONORARY CHAIRS

George Shultz
Stanford University
Leon Panetta
The Panetta Institute for Public Policy

CO-CHAIRS

Gavin Newsom
Lieutenant Governor of California
Laura Tyson
University of California, Berkeley
Michael Rossi
Sr. Advisor to the Governor on Jobs
Ashley Swearingin
Mayor of Fresno
Jessie Knight
Sempra Energy
Ashley Boren
Sustainable Conservation
Jim Earp
California Alliance for Jobs
Dave Regan
SEIU – United Healthcare Workers West
Antonia Hernandez
California Community Foundation
Sunne Wright McPeak
California Emerging Technology Fund
John Gioia
California State Association of Counties
José Cisneros
League of California Cities
Maria S. Salinas
ProAmerica Bank

STEERING COMMITTEE

Bill Allen
Los Angeles County EDC
Lucy Dunn
Orange County Business Council
Steve Frisch
Sierra Business Council
Paul Granillo (Co-Chair)
Inland Empire Economic Partnership
Carl Guardino
Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Glenda Humiston
USDA Rural Development
Joanne Kozberg
California Strategies
Lenny Mendonca
McKinsey & Co.
Bill Mueller
Valley Vision, Sacramento
Eloy Oakley (Co-Chair)
Long Beach City College
Sean Randolph
Bay Area Council, Economic Institute
Lauree Sahba
San Diego Regional EDC
Ben Stone
Sonoma County EDB

Re: Support SB 628 (Beall) Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts

Dear Governor Brown:

Finding new ways to meet the infrastructure needs of a growing population remains a top priority of the California Economic Summit, a partnership between **California Forward** and the **California Stewardship Network** that is uniting leaders of the state's regional economies around a shared prosperity agenda.

Summit leaders have cheered the efforts of the Legislature and Administration this year to provide communities with the financing tools they need to take on the state's infrastructure challenges. The Legislature's passage of Sen. Beall's SB 628—legislation that will allow local governments to form new Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts (EIFDs)—presents a unique opportunity to begin this work.

After supporting SB 628's proposals throughout the year, the Summit has released the attached white paper—*A How-to Guide for Using SB 628's Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts*—detailing how local and regional agencies could use this new authority to invest in everything from sidewalk repair and water infrastructure to the implementation of sustainable communities plans. The Summit also plans to convene local leaders in several different regions this fall to help create a pipeline of projects that could benefit from an EIFD.

Before local leaders can begin to take advantage of these new tools, of course, SB 628 must receive your signature. We urge you to complete the good work you began in your January budget proposal by signing this bill.

Your administration is no doubt aware of concerns raised during the last days of the legislative session about how these new authorities could impact affordable housing in some cities. The challenge of encouraging sustainable economic growth in the most expensive housing markets in the country is a very real one, and the Summit continues to encourage the state to create a

dedicated, statewide source of funding for affordable housing. Sen. Beall has also expressed interest in revisiting SB 628 next year to “clean up” some of its housing provisions to ensure new infrastructure financing districts don’t contribute to gentrification and displacement. Summit leaders wholeheartedly support this effort.

In the meantime, whether a public agency is interested in upgrading sidewalks and streets for stormwater collection or expanding transit stations, SB 628’s new authorities will allow local leaders to support infrastructure development in a way no other financing mechanism currently does.

With your signature, those tools can be in the hands of local governments as soon as next year—giving communities a much-needed opportunity to take on one of California’s preeminent fiscal challenges. We thank you for your support of this legislation.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Members of the California Economic Summit Infrastructure and Housing Action Teams


(NOTE: Affiliations are included for identification purposes only.)



Simon Bluestone
Vice President
MWH Americas, Inc.



Efreem Bycer
Manager, Economic Development
San Diego Regional Economic Development Corp.



Tim Gage
Principal & Co-founder, Blue Sky Consulting Group
Former Director, California Department of Finance



Stan Hazelroth
Former Director
California Infrastructure & Economic Development Bank



Robyn Hodges
Community and Social Equity Advocate, Public Policy
Analysis – Oakland



Will Kempton
Executive Director, Transportation California
Former Director, California Department of Transportation

/s/ Julie Kim

Julie Kim
Senior Fellow & Director, P3 FLIPS Program
Stanford Global Center




Jessie Knight, Jr.
Executive Vice Pres. of External Affairs, Sempra Energy
Chairman, San Diego Gas & Electric
Chairman, Southern California Gas Company



Larry Kosmont
President & CEO
Kosmont Companies



Amy Lapin
Vice President
Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.



Laurie Madigan
Executive Director
Business Leadership Alliance

/s/ **Thomas C. Nielsen**

Thomas C. Nielsen
Energy Systems, Inc.



Michael Manchak
President & CEO
Economic Vitality Corporation of San Luis Obispo County



Bev Perry
Executive Director
Southwest Megaregion Alliance



Jack Paris
President
Paris Geospatial LLC



Mark Pisano
Infrastructure Action Team co-lead
Senior Fellow, USC Sol Price School of Public Policy




Michael Pierce
Individual



Mark Whiteley
Principal
Cannon Design



Sean Randolph
Infrastructure Action Team co-lead
President & CEO, Bay Area Council Economic
Institute



Christine Rogers
Program Manager
Economic Vitality Corporation



David Smith – Housing Action Team Co-Lead
Stice & Block, LLP



Rebeca Judith Witt
School Principal
Greater Los Angeles

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]



FUNDING SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES: A HOW-TO GUIDE FOR USING ENHANCED INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING DISTRICTS IN SB 628 (BEALL)

While California’s economic outlook is beginning to brighten, the state still must grapple with some imposing fiscal challenges in the years to come—especially in finding ways to meet the infrastructure needs of its growing population. By some estimates, the state will need to invest \$765 billion in the next 10 years on everything from transportation and energy to water and school facilities, but the state and local governments only have the resources to pay for about half of this amount.

This is why the California Economic Summit’s Infrastructure Action Team spent the last year urging state leaders to provide communities with new financing tools they need to take on these challenges themselves—and to begin to invest in everything from long-neglected sidewalks and roads to the mass-transit, affordable housing, and sustainable communities that California’s long-term prosperity depends on.

With inadequate state funding for these projects—and with no sign of increased federal support—the Summit Action Team concluded that existing public resources must be complemented by a new working relationship among the public, private, and non-profit sectors.

SB 628 (Beall) identifies this same problem and offers a potential solution—proposing to expand an existing local financing authority that will allow cities and other local agencies to invest in infrastructure projects from affordable housing and transit facilities to sewage treatment, stormwater management, and water reclamation.

If structured correctly, the Summit believes these new “Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts” (EIFDs) could play an important role in driving sustainable growth by connecting a vast number of infrastructure projects with a new array of funding streams.

On the pages that follow, the Summit provides a guide for how these districts can be established and how they can operate.

HOW NEW EIFDs CAN IMPROVE LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

- **Reduce vote requirement:** While current law requires a two-thirds vote to form an Infrastructure Financing District, the new EIFDs could be formed—and could use a range of existing financial tools—without a vote. Only issuing tax increment bonds would require a vote, with a vote threshold of 55 percent.
- **Expand financing authority:** The new EIFDs would allow local leaders to support infrastructure projects through multiple funding streams, including a full complement of existing public mechanisms (tax increment authority, benefit assessments, and fees), as well as private investment.
- **Increase investment in different types of infrastructure:** The enhanced districts would be able to build every type of infrastructure: transportation, water, flood control and storm water quality management, transportation, energy, public facilities, energy, and environmental mitigation—so long as a direct connection can be established between the needed infrastructure and its users.
- **Allow more flexible institutional collaborations:** The proposal also would give communities more flexibility to accommodate regional growth by making infrastructure investments across jurisdictions through Joint Power Authorities.

CREATING A SUCCESSFUL EIFD: A HOW-TO GUIDE

SB 628’s proposed EIFDs would give communities more authority to build the infrastructure California needs to achieve its growth and sustainability goals. These financing districts would not only be able to build all public infrastructure, they could also serve as a platform for multiple funding streams—including private financing. The districts could also encourage the types of policy integration necessary to successfully implement regional sustainable communities strategies. Cities and counties, in conjunction with special districts, can successfully use this new authority by following these three steps:

STEP 1: IDENTIFY WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

To create an EIFD, a city or county—or a group of cities, counties, or other local agencies—need to identify what it is trying to accomplish (a range of desired outcomes) and then outline an investment program with the types of projects necessary to accomplish these objectives. Case studies are provided in sidebars exploring how water infrastructure and infill development projects, for example, could be supported through an EIFD.

STEP 2: LOCATE AVAILABLE FUNDING STREAMS

At the same time, the public agency must determine how to fund these investments using the wide variety of funding streams available to EIFDs. These could include state and federal funds, as well as a number of other options that make EIFDs a more robust investment mechanism than local governments currently have at their disposal. These include:

- **Assessment revenues:** The new EIFD authority would allow local agencies to conduct benefit assessments of each property—determining how much property owners would directly benefit from the infrastructure investment—and then access these resources using existing Integrating Investment Act (IIA) authority. This would require only a simple majority vote of the properties within the district.
- **Fee revenues:** The EIFD would also be able to fund investments by levying user fees under the Infrastructure Financing Authority Act (IFAA). These fees, in turn, could leverage further private investment. The IFAA is governed by Proposition 26’s vote requirements.

CASE STUDY: WATER AND OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE

GOAL: A public agency wants to upgrade sidewalks and streets, while modifying runoff systems to capture stormwater, reduce pollutants, and improve urban vegetation.

HOW AN EIFD COULD HELP: While existing, single-purpose funding makes it difficult to achieve all of these outcomes, they could be accomplished using the full range of tools provided by an EIFD—especially with the newly-expanded definition of water services signed into law in July after the passage of AB 2403 (Rendon).

ESTABLISHING THE EIFD: A city or county would take the lead due to the comprehensive nature of the general purpose authorities included. If multiple cities or counties were involved, a Joint Powers Authority could be formed. The district boundaries could be a tributary to a water body or even an entire watershed. A workplan would be developed and presented to the district properties.

CREATING INVESTMENT PROGRAM: An investment program would then be developed, identifying a range of physical improvements and their costs—sidewalks, streets, redesigned runoff, use of landscaping as water storage, and other property improvements. Localized stormwater storage, infiltration, and treatment facilities could be included. The plan would also include operations and maintenance schedules to reduce life-cycle costs.

CRAFTING A FINANCING PACKAGE: At the same time, a financing package would be developed using a “tipping point” analysis to calculate how much property values will be increased by improvements to sidewalks, streets, urban vegetation, water supply, and flood control. Assessments per parcel would be conducted and revenue streams forecast. The jurisdictions could amortize their current budgets for single-purpose investments and create availability payment schedules for assessment proceedings. Groundwater infiltration volumes could also be calculated this way to determine a revenue stream. State grants could also be leveraged for water treatment.

COMBINING INTO A STRATEGIC PLAN: Together, these assessments, water revenues, availability payments, tax increments, and state grants would support a final strategic plan directly linking infrastructure beneficiaries and payers. The EIFD would provide the authority, leadership, and institutional framework to implement it.

- **Public debt:** If the investment program requires public indebtedness, the agency could also use the authority of the EIFD to tap two public revenue sources: (1) A percentage of the growth of the non-school share of the property tax base that results from the investment (an approach similar to the one used by redevelopment agencies); or (2) An amortized portion of local budgets known as an “availability payment” that can serve as a reliable method of compensating infrastructure vendors working for a specific period of time.

STEP 3: ESTABLISH LINK BETWEEN PAYER AND BENEFICIARY

While all of these funding streams can be used in conjunction with each other, a final strategic plan combining these resources must include one last consideration: For each project and property involved, a link must be established between the payer and the beneficiary.

This is a potentially complex task, of course—one that has caused local governments for years to turn instead to sales tax measures and state bonds to support infrastructure projects. But innovations in the planning profession are making this approach much more feasible. In the “Blueprint” growth-visioning process used by the Southern California Association of Governments, for example, planners relied on geographic informational systems analysis and modeling to identify when specific land parcels experienced a “tipping point” in value as a result of public infrastructure and land-use investments. A modification of this “tipping point” analysis is under development that will allow the same approach to be used for water infrastructure—giving planners a way to determine how geomorphology within an EIFD, for example, determines how water runoff impacts individual land parcels.

By using these tools, the proportionality analysis needed to satisfy Proposition 218 and Proposition 26 can be established—and an EIFD can successfully tap into a wealth of new revenue streams directly linking infrastructure beneficiaries with taxpayers. This will empower local leaders to address local infrastructure issues—and provide California with a way to take on one of its preeminent fiscal challenges.

CASE STUDY: INFILL DEVELOPMENT

GOAL: Many cities are eager to make investments in projects like expanded transit stations, affordable housing, and mixed-use development that support the state’s sustainable communities policy framework. They will also help cities meet mobility, air quality, and energy reduction targets in Regional Transportation Plans.

HOW AN EIFD COULD HELP: While long-term funding for sustainable communities is still uncertain, EIFDs provide a complementary set of financing tools for supporting this type of growth. They can also serve as a platform for the types of policy integration necessary to successfully develop interconnected transportation, housing, and land-use projects.

ESTABLISHING THE EIFD: A city or county would take the lead due to the comprehensive nature of the general purpose authorities included. A JPA would once again be an option. The district boundaries could be a larger transit station development zone, for example, that includes collector systems.

CREATING INVESTMENT PROGRAM: An investment program would target a range of interactive physical improvements—sidewalks, streets, redesigned traffic patterns, and the use of parking structures to create more space for walking and bicycles. The EIFD investment program would also include operations and maintenance schedules to reduce life-cycle costs.

CRAFTING A FINANCING PACKAGE: A business plan would be created using a “tipping point” analysis calculating how much property values are increased by these investments. In many cases, investments like parking districts and circulation systems could generate fees that could be captured using the fee authority of the EIFD. Tax increment could also be used to leverage these assessment and fee funding streams. To encourage affordable housing development, the Strategic Growth Council could also use new cap & trade funds to further leverage this system.

COMBINING INTO A STRATEGIC PLAN: Once again, all of these new EIFD authorities would be combined in a strategic plan—one that provides cities with a unique instrument that can integrate all of the different types of projects encouraged by SB 375.



2014 SUMMIT LEADERSHIP AND PARTNERS

HONORARY CHAIRS

George Shultz

Hoover Institution, Stanford University

Leon Panetta

The Panetta Institute for Public Policy

SUMMIT CO-CHAIRS

Gavin Newsom

Lieutenant Governor of California

Michael Rossi

Senior Advisor - Office of the Governor

Laura Tyson

University of California, Berkeley

Ashley Boren

Sustainable Conservation

José Cisneros

League of California Cities

Jim Earp

California Alliance for Jobs

John Gioia

California State Association of Counties

Antonia Hernandez

California Community Foundation

Jessie Knight

Sempra Energy

Sunne Wright McPeak

California Emerging Technology Fund

Dave Regan

SEIU-United Healthcare Workers West

Maria Salinas

ProAmérica Bank

Ashley Swearengin

Mayor of Fresno

SUMMIT STEERING COMMITTEE

Bill Allen

Los Angeles County Economic
Development Corp.

Lucy Dunn

Orange County Business Council

Steve Frisch

Sierra Business Council

Paul Granillo – Co-Chair

Inland Empire Economic Partnership

Carl Guardino

Silicon Valley Leadership Group

Glenda Humiston

USDA Rural Development

Joanne Kozberg

California Strategies

Lenny Mendonca

McKinsey & Company
(ret.)

Bill Mueller

Valley Vision (Sacramento)

Eloy Oakley – Co-Chair

Long Beach City College

Sean Randolph

Bay Area Council Economic
Institute

Lauree Sahba

San Diego Regional Economic
Development Corp.

Ben Stone

Sonoma County Economic
Development Board

2013 SUMMIT UNDERWRITERS AND SPONSORS

Summit Underwriters

AT&T
Automobile Club of
Southern California
California Airports
Council
Chevron
Edison International
Metabolic Studio
Sempra Energy Utilities

Forum Underwriters

Morgan Family Foundation
Wells Fargo

Sponsoring Organizations

Applied Materials
Bridgepoint Education
Half Moon Bay Brewing Co.

Non-Profit Sponsors

California Emerging Technology Fund
Long Beach City College
The Nature Conservancy



SUMMIT PARTNERS

The California Economic Summit is a partnership of **California Forward**, an organization that works with Californians to stimulate the economy, make government more effective, and promote accountability and transparency, and the **California Stewardship Network**, a civic effort to develop regional solutions to the state's most pressing economic, environmental, and community challenges.